

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 58 and 60-64 are currently pending in this application, as amended. Claims 10-57 and 65-68 were previously cancelled in response to a Restriction Requirement. Claim 5 has been cancelled and the subject matter of claim 5 has been incorporated into independent claim 1. Claim 59 has been cancelled and the subject matter of claim 59 has been incorporated into independent claim 58. Claims 8-9 and 61 have been rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of claim 59 has also been incorporated into independent claims 63 and 64. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1-4 and 6-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,974,115 ("Breidegam *et al.*," hereinafter, "Breidegam").

The Examiner has indicated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of claim 5 has been incorporated into independent claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 6-7 remain dependent from amended claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 6-7 now contain the subject matter the Examiner deemed allowable, and therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-7 should be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

**Rejection of claims 58, 60 and 63-64**

Claims 58, 60 and 63-64 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Breidegam in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,083,117 ("Hoigaard").

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 58, 60 and 63-64 is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

**Claims 58 and 60**

The Examiner has indicated that claim 59 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of claim 59 has been incorporated into independent claim 58. Claim 60 remains dependant upon independent claim 58. Accordingly, claims 58 and 60 now contain the subject matter the Examiner deemed allowable, and therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to claims 58 and 60 should be withdrawn.

Claims 63 and 64

The Examiner has indicated that claim 59 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of claim 59 has also been incorporated into independent claims 63 and 64. Accordingly, claims 63 and 64 now contain the subject matter the Examiner deemed allowable, and therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to claims 63 and 64 should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claim 62

Claim 62 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Breidegam in view of Hoigaard and U.S. Patent No. 6,529,119 (“Kumar *et al.*,” hereinafter, “Kumar”).

Withdrawal of the rejections of claim 62 is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 62

The Examiner has indicated that claim 59 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The subject matter of claim 59 has been incorporated into independent claim 58. Claim 62 remains dependant upon independent claim 58. Accordingly, claim 62 now contains the subject matter the Examiner deemed allowable, and therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to claim 62 should be withdrawn.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The Examiner has indicated that claims 5, 8-9, 59 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 has been cancelled and the subject matter of claim 5 has been incorporated into independent claim 1. Claims 2-4 and 6-7 remain dependent from amended claim 1.

Claims 8-9 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original claim 1.

Claim 59 has been cancelled and the subject matter of claim 59 has been incorporated into independent claim 58. Claims 60 and 62 remain dependent from claim 58.

Claim 61 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original claim 58.

The subject matter of claim 59 has also been incorporated into independent claims 63 and 64.

Accordingly, the objection to claims 5 and 59 has been effectively rendered moot, and the objection to claims 8-9 and 61 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Further, claims 1-4, 6-9, 58, and 60-64 now contain the subject matter the Examiner deemed allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that the present application, as amended, including claims 1-4, 6-9, 58 and 60-64, is in condition for substantive consideration and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**William S. Richie, Jr. et al.**

June 21, 2006  
(Date)

By: 

**JOHN D. SIMMONS**

Registration No. 52,225

**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP**

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

**Direct Dial: 215-965-1268**

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: [jsimmons@akingump.com](mailto:jsimmons@akingump.com)

JDS:cmb  
7617817v1